

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

-----

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

ORDER

Plaintiff,

v.

02-cr-27-bbc

ERNEST BROOKS, III,

Defendant.

-----

Defendant Ernest Brooks, III has filed a notice of appeal of the court's June 24, 2015 order denying his motion under 18 U.S.C. § 3582, in which he asked the court to reduce his sentence. His motion was denied because the reduction in the marijuana-equivalency table to cocaine base does not provide a basis for reducing his sentence. Defendant's notice of appeal was not accompanied by the \$505 fee for filing an appeal. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A); Fed. R. App. P. 22. Therefore, I construe it as including a request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. According to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), "an appeal may not be taken in forma pauperis if the trial court certifies in writing that it is not taken in good faith." In Lee v. Clinton, 209 F.3d 1025, 1026 (7th Cir.

2000), the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit ruled that an appeal is not taken in “good faith” if it is based on a “frivolous claim” that is, “a claim that no reasonable person could suppose to have any merit.” Id. at 1026. Defendant’s claim is not “fantastical,” as were the claims in Lee, in which the allegation was that the United States and China were engaged in a conspiracy to invade and infect certain people with a mind reading device. I cannot say that petitioner’s appeal is of that type or that it is wholly without merit. However, it is a claim so clearly foreclosed by the governing law that no reasonable person would suppose it has merit.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendant Ernest Brooks III’s request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is DENIED.

Entered this 29th day of September, 2015.

BY THE COURT:  
/s/  
BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge